UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,089	12/06/2001	Gary Cole	WAVE1110-1	8837

7590   10/01/2010

ROBERT C. KOWERT
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER
YIGDALL, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/006,089	COLE, GARY
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Michael J. Yigdall	2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 September 2010</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,8-12 and 14-33</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,8-12,14-16 and 20-33</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) <u>17-19</u> is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application

after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but before the filing of a

Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil

action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the

fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on September 14, 2010 has been entered. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12 and

14-33 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant notes that in the decision on appeal, the Board of Patent Appeals and

Interferences agreed that the map table 120 in FIG. 7 of Hoover "does not store data about the

user of the multiple computer resources." Thus, Applicant concludes that the rejection of the

claims, as amended, "is not supported by the cited art" (remarks, pages 8-9).

However, the examiner does not agree with Applicant's conclusion. The examiner agrees

with the Board that the map table 120 in FIG. 7 of Hoover does not store data about the user of

the multiple computer resources. Accordingly, as set forth in the final Office action mailed on

October 31, 2007, in the advisory action mailed on February 21, 2008, and in the examiner's

answer mailed on July 7, 2008, the rejection of the claims is an <u>obviousness</u> rejection based on a

combination of Hoover and Dutcher. The examiner reiterates that the combined teachings of

Hoover and Dutcher would have suggested the claimed subject matter to those of ordinary skill

in the art. Applicant is respectfully reminded that the test for obviousness is not that the claimed

invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what

the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the

art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (C.C.P.A. 1981). Thus, the examiner

submits that the record establishes a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Specifically, the examiner notes that the claimed subject matter differs from Hoover only

in terms of the "content" of the information objects. Specifically, Hoover teaches each and every

structural element recited in claim 1. Hoover is clearly directed to a "system for managing

information" (see, for example, the abstract). Hoover teaches a "software program" such as

recited in the claim in the form of object location service 135 (see FIG. 6 and column 23, lines

34-37). Hoover further teaches an "identity index" in the form of map table 120 (see FIG. 7 and

column 23, lines 8-12). The map table 120 comprises a "virtual identity" that includes a plurality

of information object identifiers (e.g., "0011") and for each information object, a resource name

(e.g., "RDB1") identifying one of the multiple computer resources at which the respective

information object is located (see column 24, lines 40-60). The information objects are located

at multiple computer resources, such as at user computers 12 (see FIG. 6). Hoover further

teaches a "resource definition" (see column 24, lines 52-60) that comprises "connection

information" (see column 25, lines 7-19).

In Hoover, the information objects include "data about people." Indeed, the virtual

identity of Hoover is "of a user" at least in the sense that the information objects describe a

person (see column 27, lines 34-37). Nonetheless, in the sense that the people described in the

information objects are not necessarily the actual "users" of the computer resources, Hoover does

not explicitly teach Applicant's intended use of the virtual identity as "of a user of [the] multiple

computer resources." Importantly, however, Hoover teaches each and every structural element

recited in claim 1. The structure described in Hoover is capable of providing a virtual identity

that is "of a user of [the] multiple computer resources."

As noted above, Applicant's intended use of the virtual identity is "of a user of [the]

multiple computer resources." Accordingly, each information object "comprises a user account,"

such as recited in dependent claim 8. In other words, Applicant's information objects describe

computer user accounts. Hoover's information objects describe health insurance accounts and

other related healthcare accounts. Thus, the claimed subject matter differs from Hoover only in

terms of the "content" of the information objects. The examiner points out that the content of the

information objects is non-functional descriptive material.

Thus, as noted above, the virtual identity system of Hoover is capable of providing a

virtual identity "of a user of [the] multiple computer resources." A person of ordinary skill in the

art could, with predictable results, implement the virtual identity system of Hoover such that the

information objects describe computer user accounts rather than healthcare accounts. The

Dutcher reference is evidence that such computer user accounts were known in the art. Dutcher

clearly describes computer user accounts (see, for example, the abstract).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been prompted to combine the teachings

of the references at least because Dutcher describes a need for managing different computer user

accounts on multiple, heterogeneous computer resources based on a single account definition

(see, for example, column 1, lines 37-47). Hoover describes a virtual identity system that

enables one to manage different, heterogeneous user databases on multiple computer resources

based on a single, homogenous data model (see, for example, the abstract). As those of ordinary

skill in the art would appreciate, the virtual identity system of Hoover is capable of providing a

solution to the need described in Dutcher for managing different computer user accounts on

multiple, heterogeneous computer resources based on a single account definition (i.e., based on a

single, homogenous data model). Therefore, as Dutcher suggests, it would have been obvious to

those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of

Hoover such that the virtual identity is "of a user of multiple computer resources."

Likewise, the Board concluded that "it would have been obvious for an information

object to include a 'user account' for a user" (decision on appeal, page 10).

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12, 14-16 and 20-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,724,575 to Hoover et al. (already of record, "Hoover") in

view of U.S. Patent No. 6,269,405 to Dutcher et al. (already of record, "Dutcher").

With respect to claim 1 (currently amended), Hoover teaches a system for managing

information (see, for example, the abstract), comprising:

a software program stored on a computer-readable medium operable to maintain an

identity index (see, for example, object location service 135 and map table 120 in FIG. 6, and

column 23, lines 34-37, which shows that object location service 135 is operable to maintain

map table 120, and see, for example, column 23, lines 8-11, which shows that map table 120 is

an identity index), wherein said identity index comprises:

(a) a virtual identity (see, for example, map table 120 in FIG. 7, which shows a plurality

of virtual identities).

Hoover further teaches that the virtual identity is of a user (see, for example, column 27,

lines 34-37), and further teaches multiple computer resources at which information objects are

located (see, for example, user computers 12 in FIG. 6, and see below). However, in the sense

that the user is not necessarily an operator of the multiple computer resources, Hoover does not

explicitly describe that the virtual identity is "of a user of multiple computer resources."

Nonetheless, Hoover further teaches that the information objects comprise user accounts

(see, for example, column 27, lines 43-49, which shows an information object that comprises a

person's account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.). A person

of ordinary skill in the art could apply the teachings of Hoover, with predictable results, to the

user accounts of those who operate the multiple computer resources.

For example, in an analogous art, Dutcher describes a need for managing different user

accounts on multiple, heterogeneous computer resources based on a single user account

definition (see, for example, column 1, lines 37-47). Indeed, the teachings of Hoover enable the

management of different, heterogeneous user databases on multiple computer resources based on

a single, homogenous data model (see, for example, the abstract).

Therefore, as Dutcher suggests, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Hoover such that the virtual identity is "of a user of multiple computer resources."

Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests the virtual identity further comprising:

(i) a plurality of information object identifiers each corresponding to a respective information object (see, for example, column 24, lines 40-50, which shows a plurality of information object identifiers that each correspond to an information object); and

(ii) for each information object, a resource name identifying one of the multiple computer resources at which said respective information object is located, wherein said resource name is associated with said respective information object identifier (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource name "RDB1" associated with information object identifier "0011" that identifies a resource at which the information object is located); and

(b) a resource definition corresponding to each respective said named resource, wherein the resource definition further comprises connection information (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource definition corresponding to the resource that includes an object attribute table "OAT1," and column 25, lines 7-19, which further shows that the resource definition includes address or connection information).

With respect to claim 2 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 3 (original), the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said schema map maps a resource attribute from said resource to a virtual attribute defined by said schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 28-34, which shows that the object attribute table maps resource attributes to virtual attributes defined in the form of column headings).

With respect to claim 4 (original), the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that a virtual attribute value for said virtual attribute is stored in RAM (see, for example, column 27, lines 14-18, which shows that the values of the virtual attributes in the object attribute table are stored in memory).

With respect to claim 6 (previously presented), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said connection information contains a connection parameter selected from one of a hostname, a port, a resource username, a resource password or a resource type (see, for example, column 25, lines 12-16, which shows that the connection information includes parameters such as a hostname and port).

With respect to claim 8 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said information object comprises a user account (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-49, which shows an information object that comprises a user account, such as a person's account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.).

With respect to claim 9 (original), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said information object identifier comprises an account name (see, for example, FIG. 9, which shows an information object identifier "0012" that comprises an account name such as "John Doe").

With respect to claim 10 (original), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 11 (original), the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said schema map maps a resource attribute from said resource to a virtual attribute defined by said schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 28-34, which shows that the object attribute table maps resource attributes to virtual attributes defined in the form of column headings).

With respect to claim 12 (original), the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that a virtual attribute value for said virtual attribute is maintained in RAM (see, for example, column 27, lines 14-18, which shows that the values of the virtual attributes in the object attribute table are stored in memory).

With respect to claim 14 (previously presented), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said connection information contains a connection parameter selected from one of a hostname, a port, a resource username, a

resource password or a resource type (see, for example, column 25, lines 12-16, which shows

that the connection information includes parameters such as a hostname and port).

With respect to claim 15 (original), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Hoover

in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said resource is one of a Unix system, a

Windows NT system, an Oracle database system or an email server (see, for example, column

12, lines 61-63, which shows that the resource is a Unix system).

With respect to claim 16 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover

in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said software program is operable to connect

to said resource based on said resource definition (see, for example, column 25, lines 16-19,

which shows that the software program connects to the resource based on the connection

information).

With respect to claim 20 (currently amended), Hoover teaches a system for managing

information (see, for example, the abstract), comprising:

a software program stored on a computer-readable medium operable to maintain an

identity index (see, for example, object location service 135 and map table 120 in FIG. 6, and

column 23, lines 34-37, which shows that object location service 135 is operable to maintain

map table 120, and see, for example, column 23, lines 8-11, which shows that map table 120 is

an identity index), wherein said identity index comprises:

(a) a plurality of virtual identities (see, for example, map table 120 in FIG. 7, which

shows a plurality of virtual identities), wherein each virtual identity corresponds to a user (see,

for example, column 27, lines 34-37, which shows a virtual identity that corresponds to a user).

Hoover further teaches that the virtual identities are of users (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-37), and teaches multiple computer resources at which information objects are located (see, for example, user computers 12 in FIG. 6, and see below). However, in the sense that the user to which the virtual identity corresponds is not necessarily an operator of the multiple computer resources, Hoover does not explicitly describe that the virtual identities are "of users of multiple computer resources" and that each virtual identity "corresponds to a particular user of multiple computer resources."

Nonetheless, Hoover further teaches that the information objects comprise user accounts (see, for example, column 27, lines 43-49, which shows an information object that comprises a person's account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.). A person of ordinary skill in the art could apply the teachings of Hoover, with predictable results, to the user accounts of those who operate the multiple computer resources.

For example, in an analogous art, Dutcher describes a need for managing different user accounts on multiple, heterogeneous computer resources based on a single user account definition (see, for example, column 1, lines 37-47). Indeed, the teachings of Hoover enable the management of different, heterogeneous user databases on multiple computer resources based on a single, homogenous data model (see, for example, the abstract).

Therefore, as Dutcher suggests, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Hoover such that the virtual identities are "of users of multiple computer resources" and that each virtual identity "corresponds to a particular user of multiple computer resources."

Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that each virtual identity further comprises:

(i) a plurality of information object identifiers, wherein each information object identifier corresponds to a respective information object (see, for example, column 24, lines 40-50, which shows a plurality of information object identifiers that each correspond to an information object); and

(ii) a plurality of resource names, wherein each resource name is associated with an information object identifier and each resource name corresponds to one of the multiple computer resources at which the information object corresponding to the associated information object identifier is located (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource name "RDB1" associated with information object identifier "0011" that identifies a resource at which the information object is located); and

(b) a plurality of resource definitions comprising a resource definition for each named computer resource, wherein each resource definition comprises connection information for the corresponding named computer resource (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource definition corresponding to the resource that includes an object attribute table "OAT1," and column 25, lines 7-19, which further shows that the resource definition includes address or connection information).

With respect to claim 21 (original), the rejection of claim 20 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that each resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 22 (original), the rejection of claim 20 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that each information object comprises a user account (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-49, which shows an information object that comprises a user account, such as a person's account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.).

With respect to claim 23 (original), the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that each information object identifier comprises an account name (see, for example, FIG. 9, which shows an information object identifier "0012" that comprises an account name such as "John Doe").

With respect to claim 24 (original), the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that each resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 25 (previously presented), the rejection of claim 24 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests that each said schema map maps a resource attribute from said resource to a virtual attribute defined by said schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 28-34, which shows that the object attribute table maps resource attributes to virtual attributes defined in the form of column headings).

With respect to claim 26 (previously presented), Hoover teaches a method of managing information (see, for example, the abstract), comprising:

storing an identity index comprising a plurality of information object identifiers

corresponding to a set of information objects that define a user (see, for example, map table 120

in FIG. 6, and column 23, lines 8-11, which shows that map table 120 is an identity index, and

see, for example, column 24, lines 40-50, which shows a plurality of information object

identifiers that each correspond to an information object, and column 27, lines 34-37, which

shows an information object that defines a user).

Hoover further teaches multiple computer resources at which information objects are

located (see, for example, user computers 12 in FIG. 6, and see below). However, in the sense

that the user whom the information objects define is not necessarily an operator of the multiple

computer resources, Hoover does not explicitly describe that the user is "a user of multiple

computer resources."

Nonetheless, Hoover further teaches that the information objects comprise user accounts

(see, for example, column 27, lines 43-49, which shows an information object that comprises a

person's account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.). A person

of ordinary skill in the art could apply the teachings of Hoover, with predictable results, to the

user accounts of those who operate the multiple computer resources.

For example, in an analogous art, Dutcher describes a need for managing different user

accounts on multiple, heterogeneous computer resources based on a single user account

definition (see, for example, column 1, lines 37-47). Indeed, the teachings of Hoover enable the

management of different, heterogeneous user databases on multiple computer resources based on

a single, homogenous data model (see, for example, the abstract).

Therefore, as Dutcher suggests, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Hoover such that the user is "a user of multiple computer resources."

Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches or suggests:

associating a resource definition with each information object identifier, wherein each resource definition corresponds to a different one of the multiple computer resources at which the information object corresponding to the associated information object identifier is located, and wherein each resource definition contains connection information for the corresponding computer resource (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource definition associated with information object identifier "0011" and corresponding to a resource at which the information object is located that includes an object attribute table "OAT1," and column 25, lines 7-19, which further shows that the resource definition includes address or connection information).

With respect to claim 27 (previously presented), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and Hoover in view Dutcher further teaches or suggests that each information object identifier from said plurality of information object identifiers comprises a native key for the corresponding information object (see, for example, column 24, lines 8-16, which shows that the information object identifiers comprise native keys for the corresponding information objects).

With respect to claim 28 (original), the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated, and Hoover in view Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said native key comprises an account name (see,

for example, FIG. 9, which shows an information object identifier "0012" that comprises an

account name such as "John Doe").

With respect to claim 29 (previously presented), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated,

and Hoover in view Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said associating a resource

definition with each information object identifier further comprises associating at least one

resource name with each information object identifier (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60,

which shows a resource name "RDB1" associated with information object identifier "0011").

With respect to claim 30 (original), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and Hoover

in view Dutcher further teaches or suggests that each information object comprises a user

account (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-49, which shows an information object that

comprises a user account, such as a person's account with an insurance company, health

maintenance organization, etc.).

With respect to claim 31 (original), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and Hoover

in view Dutcher further teaches or suggests that each resource definition further comprises a

schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute

table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 32 (original), the rejection of claim 31 is incorporated, and Hoover

in view Dutcher further teaches or suggests that said schema map maps a resource attribute to a

virtual attribute (see, for example, column 27, lines 28-34, which shows that the object attribute

table maps resource attributes to virtual attributes defined in the form of column headings).

With respect to claim 33 (original), the rejection of claim 31 is incorporated, and Hoover in view Dutcher further teaches or suggests creating a composite view of a user based on said schema map from each resource definition (see, for example, column 25, lines 20-35, which shows creating a composite view of a user).

Allowable Subject Matter

5.   Claims 17-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (see the Board's decision on appeal, page 11).

Conclusion

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Yigdall whose telephone number is (571) 272-3707. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you

would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael J. Yigdall/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2192